

families buy would jump in price from \$11 to possibly \$20 to \$25. This is the kind of sudden price increase that can blow a big hole in a family's budget.

I did not come to Congress to raise taxes—even import taxes—on American citizens, especially not a 74-percent increase.

Moreover, China would likely retaliate against a loss of MFN status by restricting U.S. exports to and investment in China. Hong Kong and Taiwan would also be especially hurt: Hong Kong would lose at least 61,000 jobs.

But more important would be the effect on my Kansas constituents. One out of every seven Boeing 737's built in Wichita is sold to China and subcontractors in the Kansas City area would lose jobs if this trade were interrupted. China always has the option of buying Airbus; Boeing cannot so easily sell its airplanes somewhere else. And if Boeing can't sell its planes, many of my constituents will lose their jobs. And, of course, China is also a prime customer of Kansas farmers.

There is also the question of what China would do to make up for the loss of hard currency that removal of MFN would cause. What else does China make that finds an international market? Arms—and technology that can be used for producing weapons of mass destruction. If China were to increase these sales, our security interests would be directly threatened.

I do not intend to defend the Clinton administration's policy—if indeed it even has one—toward China. In fact, the many allegations involving illicit Chinese involvement in the American political system and how that involvement might be related to administration policy toward China has been a major concern of mine about the renewal of MFN. This administration's reluctance to address the potential security threat that China's military buildup could pose to the United States in the future has contributed greatly to the public's unease about trade relations with China.

But I do not agree with those who believe this vote represents appeasement of an obviously hostile power. Unlike the case of the Soviet Union in the late 1940's, I do not see evidence that the Chinese Government has resolved to proceed with an aggressive military strategy to achieve their goals. What is certain is that our allies, both in East Asia and Europe, will not treat China as a military treat.

Americans—especially farmers in Kansas and elsewhere—learned a painful lesson during the Carter administration about the futility of unilateral sanctions. Since clearly the United States cannot at this time—especially under the present administration—rally the rest of the world into an anti-China coalition, any move by the United States to isolate China would instead isolate us.

I was frequently asked during my campaign last year about my position on this difficult issue. I responded then that I favored MFN not for China's sake, but for America's. Having weighed carefully the substantial evidence on both sides, I continue to believe that it is in this country's interest, and in the interest of the moral principles we represent, to maintain a normal trading relationship with China.

TRIBUTE TO MORTI HIRSCH

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 9, 1997

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I want to recognize Mr. Morti Hirsch, a long-time resident of Brooklyn, for his outstanding civic contributions. Morti is the owner of Active Fire Sprinkler Corp., the largest fire sprinkler company in Brooklyn. His company employees several hundred Brooklynites.

A professional engineer, Morti Hirsch is affiliated with the American Society of Sanitary Engineers, of which he is a past president. He has also been the past president of the New York Fire Sprinklers Contractors Association. Active in many professional arenas, Mr. Hirsch also founded the Brooklyn Navy Yard for Foreign Business, of which 200 small- and medium-size companies are members.

Mr. Hirsch was born in Brownsville, Brooklyn, where he has lived for over half of his life. For the past 27 years he has worked at the Brooklyn Navy Yard and is the father of three children, Eve, Joseph, and Ann. I am pleased to acknowledge the contributions of Mr. Morti Hirsch.

BALANCED BUDGET ACT OF 1997

SPEECH OF

HON. MAX SANDLIN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 25, 1997

Mr. SANDLIN. Mr. Speaker, today the House of Representatives passed the Budget Reconciliation Spending Act, H.R. 2015, a bill to reduce spending programs. I voted to protect seniors, children, low income workers, and Texas. While I strongly support the goal of the legislation to balance the Federal budget, and while I voted for the balanced budget agreement of 1997, I could not support this legislation.

I support Medicare reform to extend the solvency of the Medicare Program. However, this bill cuts Medicare by \$115 billion and still only extends the program for only 8 years, not the 10 years called for in the budget agreement. The proposed changes saddle health care providers with over \$100 billion of the cuts, potentially leading to a deterioration in the quality of care. In addition to these cuts, Medicare premiums for the average beneficiary would rise by over \$15 per month, placing an unbearable burden on many seniors vulnerable to rising costs.

In addition to higher premiums for Medicare beneficiaries, this bill also hits another senior group by cutting veterans' benefits. The legislation reduces veterans' benefit cost of living adjustment [COLA] by rounding down and by limiting future increases.

We have created laws to protect workers from abuse in our society. However, the Budget Reconciliation Spending Act specifically exempts from these laws workers who are trying to leave the welfare rolls for jobs. These workers would be denied worker protections against discrimination and sexual harassment and not allowed time off for family and medical leave to be with their families in times of need.

We should be giving these workers more reasons to find a good job, not giving them more reasons to stay on welfare.

Workers in my district would be further harmed by this legislation because of provisions to privatize food stamp and Medicaid eligibility. Aside from concerns regarding a profit-seeking company determining the Medicaid eligibility of an impoverished family, this provision would jeopardize the jobs of State employees everywhere. These people work hard at their jobs, do an excellent job, and do not deserve to lose their jobs in order to reach a questionable goal.

Finally, the State of Texas bears a disproportionate share of Medicaid savings under the House reconciliation proposal regarding disproportionate share hospital [DSH] payments. Texas alone represents over 13 percent of the cuts to the DSH program, and will have DSH payments cut by 40 percent in the year 2002. Texas has the third largest Medicaid population in the country and is disproportionately affected by legal and illegal immigrant populations. DSH payments to Texas are used to serve the uninsured population, especially in rural areas. Many people in this population, with no other options for health care, could be denied basic health care services if this provision is included.

I want to see a balanced budget. I have made a pledge to the people of east Texas to work for a balanced budget. Unfortunately, I cannot support a balanced budget that balances the budget on the backs of seniors, children, workers, and Texas health care funds. This bill is bad for the American working families, bad for the American economy, and bad for America. I urge my colleagues on the conference committee to compromise on a bill that benefits working Americans instead of one that harms them.

THE BOROUGH OF PHILIPSBURG— 200 YEARS OF HISTORY AND SPIRIT

HON. BUD SHUSTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 10, 1997

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the 200th anniversary of the founding of one of the great boroughs in my congressional district, the borough of Philipsburg in Centre County, PA.

Philipsburg is located in the Moshannon Valley, a region rich in history and spirit. The area was a dense wilderness in 1794 when two Englishmen, one by the name of Henry Philips, decided to settle on a tract of land in a mountainous region beside Moshannon Creek. The only road into town was a footpath, a far cry from modern Philipsburg's transportation network. In 1797, Philips and his partner attracted the first 12 settlers by offering them each a house lot in town and 4 acres of land. These 12 individuals faced a formidable task in carving out a settlement from the thick forest. Nevertheless, by winter of that same year, signs of civilization appeared in the form of cabins and mills, and the first use of the word "Philipsburg" appeared in the daybook of the Philips' store. Over the next 67 years, the settlement matured into a thriving community, finally being incorporated